



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-20076-2026
Decided on : 19.05.2026

GURPREET SINGH @ GORAPetitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurpreet Singh @ Gora, aged about 22 years	215	16.09.2024	109, 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (corresponding to sections 307, 506, 148, 149 of IPC) and S. 25, 27 of Arms Act	Gharinda	Amritsar

2. As per the FIR registered at the instance of complainant Pritam Singh, aged 55 years, on 15.09.2024, at about 8:00 P.M., when he was present in his house along with his wife Baljeet Kaur and sons Arshbir Singh and Major Singh, persons Inderbir Singh @ Amb and Gora came to the door of his house and started calling for his third son, Karanbir Singh. On being informed that he was not at home, the



complainant was asked to reach a nearby chowk along with his wife and two sons. When they reached the spot, they found i) Sunny, ii) Ravi, and iii) Karanbir Singh s/o Gurvil present there, who started arguing with the complainant party. During this, accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb took out a pistol and fired two shots—one of which missed, while the second hit Baljeet Kaur on her right thigh. On hearing the sound of firing, several people gathered at the spot, and the accused fled away.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that even if the incident, as alleged, is taken to be true, the firearm injury suffered by the injured Baljeet Kaur is on a non-vital part of the body. Had there been any intention to cause her death, the co-accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb would have aimed or repeated the shot on a vital part of the body. Thus, it would remain a moot question during the trial whether the act was intended to terrorize the complainant party or to commit murder.

4. It is further argued that petitioner has not been attributed any specific role in the alleged occurrence. There is no allegation against the petitioner that he was armed with any weapon. Therefore, even if his presence at the spot is presumed, there is no active participation attributed to him. Petitioner is in custody since 04.08.2025, i.e. for a period of about nine months and 14 days. Out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined, till date. Thus, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, keeping him incarcerated any further would serve no useful purpose.

Additionally, it is submitted that co-accused namely Ravi Singh and Karanbir Singh @ Karandeep Singh have already been granted



the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 10.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-48677-2025 (Annexure P-3). Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 18.05.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 09 months and 14 days period inside jail.

6. While opposing the plea of bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that petitioner, while accompanying with the main accused, had allegedly hurled abuses and extended threats to the complainant party. However, he fairly concedes that there is no allegation that he being armed with any weapon or having inflicted any injury. The other factual aspects, as noticed above, are not disputed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. Having considered the rival submissions and the material available on record, it is noticed that the specific act of firing is attributed only to the co-accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb. Petitioner is in custody since 04.08.2025, i.e. for a period of about 9 months and 14 days, and *challan* has already been presented. However, out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined, till date. Therefore, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Role attributed to the petitioner is



CRM-M-20076-2026

4

limited to mere presence at the spot. Moreover, co-accused namely Ravi Singh and Karanbir Singh @ Karandeep Singh have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 10.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-48677-2025 (Annexure P-3).

9. In view of the totality of circumstances and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.05.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**